

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION**

Laura Schmid,

Plaintiff,

vs.

The Benefit Company, Inc.,

Defendant.

Case No: 3:17-649-MBS

**PLAINTIFF'S ANSWERS TO LOCAL RULE
26.01 INTERROGATORIES**

Plaintiff, by and through her undersigned counsel, respectfully submits the following answers to the Court's Local Rule 26.01 Interrogatories:

INTERROGATORY A: State the full name, address, and telephone number of all persons or legal entities who may have a subrogation interest in each claim and state the basis and extent of said interest.

ANSWER: None are known to Plaintiff.

INTERROGATORY B: As to each claim, state whether it should be tried jury or nonjury and why.

ANSWER: A jury trial would be available under the Fair Labor Standards Act but not ERISA. Plaintiff does not seek a jury trial.

INTERROGATORY C: State whether the party submitting these responses is a publicly owned company and separately identify: (1) each publicly owned company of which it is a parent, subsidiary, partner, or affiliate; (2) each publicly owned company which owns ten percent or more of the outstanding share or other indicia of ownership

Plaintiff's Answers to Local Rule 26.01 Interrogatories
Schmid v. The Benefit Company, Inc.
Page 2 of 3

of the party: and (3) each publicly owned company in which the party owns ten percent or more of the outstanding shares.

ANSWER: Plaintiff is not a publicly owned company.

INTERROGATORY D: State the basis for asserting the claim in the division in which it was filed.

ANSWER: Defendant is based in Richland County, South Carolina.

INTERROGATORY E: Is this action related in whole or in part to any other matter filed in this District, whether civil or criminal? If so, provide: (1) a short caption and the full case number of the related action; (2) an explanation of how the matters are related; and (3) a statement of the status of the related action. Counsel should disclose any cases which *may be* related regardless of whether they are still pending. Whether cases *are* related such that they should be assigned to a single judge will be determined by the Clerk of Court based on a determination of whether the cases: arise from the same or identical transactions, happenings, or events; involve the identical parties or property; or for any other reason would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.

ANSWER: This action is not related to any other matter filed in this District.

(SIGNATURE BLOCK ON FOLLOWING PAGE)

Plaintiff's Answers to Local Rule 26.01 Interrogatories

Schmid v. The Benefit Company, Inc.

Page 3 of 3

SARVIS LAW, LLC

By: s/Bryn C. Sarvis

Bryn C. Sarvis

Fed Bar # 10478

3347-B Augusta Highway

Gilbert, SC 29054

Email: bsarvis@sarvislaw.com

(803) 785-5525 Ofc

(803) 610-2655 Fax

March 8, 2017

Attorney for Plaintiff